

VOLUME 1. Part 10. Pp. 225-256.

28th FEBRUARY 1947

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of
**THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON
ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE**

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission

Proposed suspension of the *Règles* to suppress the name *Raphistoma Rafinesque*, 1815 (Class Pisces, Order Syngnathiformes) and to validate the name *Raphistoma Hall*, 1847 (Class Gastropoda, Order Archaeogastropoda). By J. Brookes Knight, *Department of Geology, Princeton University, New Jersey*; L. R. Cox, Sc.D., *Department of Geology, British Museum (Natural History)*; K. P. Oakley, *Department of Geology, British Museum (Natural History)*; Josiah Bridge, *Palaeontologist, U.S. Geological Survey, Washington, D.C.*; Edwin Kirk, *U.S. Geological Survey, Washington, D.C.*; the late J. R. Norman; Ethelwynn Trewavas, D.Sc., *Department of Zoology, British Museum (Natural History)*; the late E. O. Ulrich; Leonard P. Schultz, *Division of Fishes, Smithsonian Institution, U.S. National Museum, Washington, D.C.*; and George S. Myers, *Professor of Biology and Head Curator of Zoological Collections, Natural History Museum, Stanford University, California*

p. 225

Proposal to suppress the generic name *Teleosteus* Volger, 1860, and the specific name *Teleosteus primaevus* Volger, 1860 (Class Anthozoa). By Adolf Zilch, *Department of Invertebrate Zoology, Natur-Museum, Senckenberg, Frankfurt a.M.*

p. 228

On the relative merits of the names Bryozoa and Polyzoa as the name for the Class in the Animal Kingdom now known by one or other of these names. By Sir Sidney F. Harmer, D.Sc., F.R.S., *formerly Director of the British Museum (Natural History)*

p. 230

(continued on back wrapper)

LONDON :

Printed by Order of the International Committee on
Zoological Nomenclature
and

Sold on their behalf by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature
at the Publications Office of the Trust
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.

1947

Price five shillings and seven pence

(All rights reserved)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMISSION

A. The Officers of the Commission

President: Dr. Karl Jordan, Ph.D., F.R.S. (United Kingdom).

Vice-President: Dr. James L. Peters (U.S.A.).

Secretary: Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (United Kingdom).

B. The Members of the Commission

Class 1949

Senor Dr. Angel CABRERA (Argentina).

Mr. Francis HEMMING (United Kingdom) (*Secretary to the Commission*).

Dr. Karl JORDAN (United Kingdom) (*President of the Commission*).

Dr. Theodor MORTENSEN (Denmark).

Dr. Joseph PEARSON (Australia).

Herr Professor Dr. Rudolf RICHTER (Germany).

Class 1952

Senhor Dr. Afranio do AMARAL (Brazil).

Professor James Chester BRADLEY (U.S.A.).

Professor Ludovico di CAPORACCO (Italy).

Professor J. R. DYMOND (Canada).

Dr. James L. PETERS (U.S.A.) (*Vice-President of the Commission*).

Dr. Harold E. VOKES (U.S.A.).

Class 1955

Professor Dr. Hilbrand BOSCHMA (Netherlands).

Dr. William Thomas CALMAN (United Kingdom).

Professor Teiso ESAKI (Japan).

Professor Béla von HANKÓ (Hungary).

Dr. T. JACZEWSKI (Poland).

Dr. Norman R. STOLL (U.S.A.).

C. The Staff of the Secretariat in London

Secretary to the Commission: Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Archivist: Mr. Francis J. Griffin, A.L.A.

D. The Address of the Commission

Secretariat of the Commission:

British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London, S.W. 7.

Personal address of the Secretary:

83, Fellows Road (Garden Flat), London, N.W. 3.

E. The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

The Officers of the Trust:

Chairman: Colonel Right Hon. Walter Elliot, M.C., M.P., F.R.S.

Managing Director and Secretary: Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Registrar: Mr. A. S. Pankhurst.

The address of the Trust and its Publications Office:

41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W. 7.

**PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE RÈGLES TO SUPPRESS THE NAME
RAPHISTOMA RAFINESQUE, 1815 (CLASS PISCES, ORDER
SYNENTOGNATHI) AND TO VALIDATE THE NAME RAPHISTOMA
HALL, 1847 (CLASS GASTROPODA, ORDER ARCHAEOGASTROPODA)**

By J. BROOKES KNIGHT

(Department of Geology, Princeton University, New Jersey),

L. R. COX, Sc.D.

(Department of Geology, British Museum (Natural History)),

K. P. OAKLEY

(Department of Geology, British Museum (Natural History)),

JOSIAH BRIDGE

(Palaeontologist, U.S. Geological Survey, Washington, D.C.),

EDWIN KIRK

(U.S. Geological Survey, Washington, D.C.),

the late J. R. NORMAN,

ETHELWYNN TREWAVAS, D.Sc.

(Department of Zoology, British Museum (Natural History)),

the late E. O. ULRICH,

LEONARD P. SCHULTZ

(Division of Fishes, Smithsonian Institution, United States National Museum,
Washington, D.C.),

and

GEORGE S. MYERS

(Professor of Biology and Head Curator of Zoological Collections, Natural History Museum,
Stanford University, California).

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)145.)

The undersigned, specialists in the fields of Palaeozoic Gastropoda and of living fishes, petition the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to suppress the name *Raphistoma* Rafinesque, 1815, *Analyse Nat.* : 89 (Pisces), under suspension of the rules, in favour of its subsequent homonym *Raphistoma* Hall, 1847, *Nat. Hist. New York* (Pal.) 1 : 28 (Mollusca, Gastropoda), and of its subsequent objective synonym *Belone* Cuvier, 1817, *Règn. anim.* 2 : 185, on the ground that the application of the rules would lead to greater confusion than uniformity. As matters stand today, the name *Raphistoma* Rafinesque has been largely overlooked, and is not employed by systematists in fishes, though it is seemingly a valid prior objective synonym of the widely employed name *Belone* Cuvier, 1817, while the invalid *Raphistoma* Hall, 1847, has been widely employed for a genus of Palaeozoic gastropods since its proposal some ninety years ago.

The name *Raphistoma* Rafinesque appeared in that author's *Analyse de la*

Nature, published in Palermo in 1815, an excessively rare work. Here we find on page 89 the following:—

III. O. *Gastropia* Les Abdominaux

1. Sous-Ordre. Brachistomia, Les Brachistomes [defined —]

19. Famille Siagonia, Les Siagéniens.

2. S. F. ESOXIDIA. Les Esoxides. Une seule nageoire dorsale, dos non aquillonne.

G. 5. *Esox* L. 6. *Raphistoma* R. *Belone* Gr. 7. *Lepiosteus* Lac. 8. *Synodus* Lac. 9. *Megalops* Lac. 10. *Elops* L. 11. *Stomias* R.

In a memorandum furnished in 1934 Mr. J. R. Norman, Assistant Keeper, Department of Zoology, British Museum (Natural History), one of the co-signatories of the present petition, who was consulted relative to the validity of *Raphistoma* Rafinesque and its status among ichthyologists, stated:—

Rafinesque refers to *Belone* Gronovius. No trace of *Belone* is to be found in Gronovius's *Zoophylacium*, 1763–1781, or in the *Museum Ichthyol.*, 1754–1756, except in the index to the former work. Here we find “Bellone No. 362”, but on turning up No. 362 in the text we find no trace of this word. However, the species referred to under No. 362 is clearly the Gar-fish of European seas, i.e. *Esox belone* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) 1: 314.

Thus it seems that the species *Esox belone* Linnaeus is genotype of *Raphistoma* Rafinesque, 1815, by monotypy. But *Esox belone* Linnaeus is also genotype of *Belone* Cuvier, 1817, by absolute tautonymy and hence *Belone* Cuvier, 1817, a name widely used and currently in good standing for the genus in question, is a subsequent exact or objective synonym of *Raphistoma* Rafinesque, 1815, a name that has been almost wholly overlooked. If the rules are rigidly enforced, the almost unknown name *Raphistoma* must of necessity replace the well-known and widely used *Belone* Cuvier, 1817, a substitution that is highly undesirable from any point of view save that of the most sterile priority.

Furthermore, unless the name *Raphistoma* Rafinesque, 1815, is set aside under the plenary power, the rigid enforcement of the rules would require the suppression of *Raphistoma* Hall, 1847, *Nat. Hist. New York* (Pal.) 1: 28, a name widely in use for a genus of Palaeozoic gastropods since it was first proposed, and currently in good standing, as a subsequent invalid homonym of *Raphistoma* Rafinesque, 1815. This again would serve no good purpose, and would inevitably lead to confusion.

J. Brookes Knight
(Paleozoic Gastropoda, Princeton University)¹

J. R. Norman
(Department of Zoology, British Museum (Natural History))

L. R. Cox
(Department of Geology, British Museum (Natural History)) (see my attached note) (Annex 1)

Ethelwynn Trewavas
(Department of Zoology, British Museum (Natural History))

K. P. Oakley
(Department of Geology, British Museum (Natural History))

E. O. Ulrich
(U.S. National Museum, Washington, D.C.)

¹ Dr. J. Brookes Knight has since become Research Associate in Palaeontology, Smithsonian Institution, United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.

Josiah Bridge
(Palaeontologist, U.S. Geological Survey,
Washington, D.C.)

Leonard P. Schultz
(Division of Fishes, U.S. National
Museum, Washington, D.C.)

Edwin Kirk
(U.S. Geological Survey, Washington,
D.C.)

G. S. Myers
(Stanford University) (see my attached
note) (Annex 2)

ANNEX 1.

Supplementary Note by L. R. Cox, Sc.D.

(Assistant Keeper, Department of Geology, British Museum (Natural History).)

Since no bibliographic reference is given by Rafinesque and the trivial name *belone* was not applied by Gronovius to any species, we can only guess that Rafinesque intended to found the genus *Raphistoma* upon the species *Esox bellone* Linnaeus. Hence the name *Raphistoma* would appear to have been published without a definition, description, or indication as defined by *Opinion* 1, and may be ignored. It further appears doubtful if the "Bellone" of Gronovius' index can be accepted as more than a vernacular name, and, according to *Opinion* 1 again, "In no case is the word 'indication' to be construed as including vernacular names".

However, since other workers may object to this interpretation of the rules, it seems desirable to have *Raphistoma* Rafinesque ruled out by a definite *Opinion*.

ANNEX 2.

Supplementary Note by GEORGE S. MYERS.

(Professor of Biology and Head Curator, Zoological Collections, Natural History Museum,
Stanford University.)

I have not seen the original of Rafinesque's *Analyse*, but, if the passage quoted in the accompanying memorandum is correct, I am inclined to agree with Dr. Cox that *Raphistoma* of Rafinesque, 1815, is not available under the rules. My reasons are exactly those put forward by Dr. Cox. It should be noted that Mr. Fowler, of the Philadelphia Academy, has rejected *Raphistoma* Rafinesque, evidently with much the same things in mind (see his "Marine Fishes of West Africa" in 1936, *Bull. Amer. Mus. nat. Hist.* 70 (1) : 438).

The late Dr. D. S. Jordan (1917, *Genera of Fishes* (1) : 91) attempts to explain Rafinesque's reference to Gronovius, but says: "This reference does not seem to justify the substitution of *Ramphistoma* [sic] for *Belone*." It will be noted that the accompanying memorandum, as well as Jordan, quotes Rafinesque's page 89, whereas Fowler (*loc. cit.*) gives the page as "15". This should be investigated.

It should be impressed upon the Commission that *Belone* Cuvier is today a universally recognised genus in ichthyology, and the family of the marine gars (a world-wide group) is based on it. I have come across only one recent author who has accepted Rafinesque's name. De Buen (1935, *Instituto esp. Oceanogr.*, Madrid, *Notas y Resúmenes* (2) 88 : 69) quotes "*Rhamphistoma* [sic] Rafinesque 1810 [sic]", and in the synonymy of *Rhamphistoma* [sic] *belone* (Linn.) he lists "1810, *Rhamphistoma* [sic] *vulgaris* Rafinesque". He gives no more exact reference to any of Rafinesque's papers. So far as I know,

Rafinesque published only two papers on fishes in 1810 (the *Indice d'ittologia siciliana* and his *Caratteri*) and I find no reference to a name "*Rhamphistoma*" or a "*R. vulgaris*" in either. The synonymic quotation directly above—"1810, *Belone acus* Risso"—is also non-existent, and I think that we may safely discount these references.

I fully agree with Dr. Cox that, in view of the possibility of disagreement on the availability of Rafinesque's *Raphistoma*, it would be desirable to have this name ruled out definitely by the Commission. Its use, in ichthyology, would certainly lead to greater confusion than uniformity.

PROPOSAL TO SUPPRESS THE GENERIC NAME *TELEOSTEUS* VOLGER, 1860, AND THE SPECIFIC NAME *TELEOSTEUS PRIMAEVUS* VOLGER, 1860 (CLASS ANTHOZOA)

By ADOLF ZILCH.

(Department of Invertebrate Zoology, Natur-Museum Senckenberg, Frankfurt a.M.)

(translation from the German original)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)132.)

Volger, 1860, *Ber. Offenbach. Ber. Naturk.* 1:37, described from the Hunsrück-slate of Caub (Lower Devonian, Siegen division) a distinctive fossil as *Teleosteus primaevus*, which he believed to be "the first trace of an osseous fish" found "in the Transition Rocks". Volger said about this find (: 52): "Everyone who inspects it recognises it at once as the tail-fin, united with the last joints of the spine, of an osseous fish, which shows itself to be a true scaled fish by the strong development of the vertebrae as well as by the absence of any trace of an integumental covering. Moreover, according to this relic, the species is seen to be a perfectly symmetrically forked fish". . . . "This remnant, therefore, is the first and so far the only proof that osseous fishes existed in the Transition Era. Hence, it appears to me provisionally to deserve the name by which I have designated it: 'der Ur-Gräthenfisch' (*Teleosteus primaevus*)". Although Volger preferred "eine treue Abbildung einer auf Grund der Auffassung verdeutlichten Darstellung", he described this new genus and species as follows:—

Man erkennt drei kräftige Wirbelkörper, ohne eine Spur ansitzender Dornen. Von fächerförmig gestellten platten Knochenstücken an der Wurzel der Schwanzfinne oder von einer plattenartigen Ausbildung eines letzten Wirbels ist nichts zu erkennen. Die Wurzel der Schwanzfinne erscheint ziemlich verdickt und ohne deutliche Spur der Strahlen. Um so schärfer treten letztere auf der ganzen ausgebreiteten Fläche der Schwanzfinne hervor. Man erkennt eine nach hinten zunehmende Zahl von solchen Strahlen. . . . Jedenfalls haben wir hier auf dem *Uebergangsschiefer von Caub* den *gleichgabeligen Schwanz* eines *Gräthenfisches* vor uns—und damit eine neue *Thatsache*, welche allerdings berechtigt ist, auf unsere Anschauungen von der Geschichte der Thierwelt einen bedeutenden Einfluss zu beanspruchen.

According to Volger's own statements, eminent contemporaries—like vom Rath—saw the specimen, but it was less the systematic position of the fossil and much more the high geological age of the rocks which was doubted. It was assumed to be, perhaps, a fish-slate from Glarus.

During the preparation of the Catalogue of Types in the Natur-Museum Senckenberg, the original specimen of *Teleosteus primaevus* Volger, 1860,² has been found, correctly arranged among the corals of the Hunsrück-slate. It is indeed, in fact, a Devonian tetra-coral; it belongs to the same species as that which Sandberger (1889, *Jb. nass. Ver. Naturh.* 42 : 100 pl. 1 figs. 1-4) named *Rhipidophyllum vulgare*.

If the International Rules of Zoological Nomenclature are strictly applied, the species *Rhipidophyllum vulgare* Sandberger, 1889, and the genus *Rhipidophyllum* Sandberger, 1889, will have to receive the names *Teleosteus primaevus* Volger, 1860, and *Teleosteus* Volger, 1860, respectively. As the name "*Teleosteus*" would be misleading for a genus of corals and as, further, Sandberger's designation "*Rhipidophyllum-slate*" (= Hunsrück-slate) is of historical importance, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature are asked to make use of its plenary powers to suspend the rules and to declare the names *Teleosteus* Volger, 1860, and *Teleosteus primaevus*, 1860, to be unavailable.

² For a figure of the type of *Teleosteus primaevus* Volger, 1860, see Zilch, 1937, *Senckenbergiana* 19 : 431-432.

ON THE RELATIVE MERITS OF THE NAMES BRYOZOA AND POLYZOA AS THE NAME FOR THE CLASS IN THE ANIMAL KINGDOM NOW KNOWN BY ONE OR OTHER OF THESE NAMES

By SIR SIDNEY F. HARMER, D.Sc., F.R.S.

(formerly Director of the British Museum (Natural History).)

(Communicated by W. L. SCLATER, M.A., at the request of the "Zoological Record Committee" of the Zoological Society of London.)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)72.)

The name "Bryozoa" was introduced by Ehrenberg; but I am under the disadvantage of not having the memoirs of that author bearing on the subject. In the *Zoological Record* for 1880 (1881, *Zool. Rec.* 17: 113 (Molluscoidea)), the date of Bryozoa is given as 1831, with a query. This seems to be Ehrenberg's *Symbolae physicae* of that date; but I do not think that "Bryozoa" occurs there. This is, however, irrelevant, because Thompson (1830) is admittedly earlier in date, and the decision which name should be used does not depend entirely on the question of priority.

I fully admit that (1) Ehrenberg formally introduced "Bryozoa" as the name of a Class in 1839 (*Abh. K. Akad. Wiss.*, Berlin a.d. Jahre 1838, Table 1, following page 120), and (2) that Thompson, 1830, *Zool. Researches*, Mem. 5, did not do so.

Thompson understood by "Polyzoa" an animal inhabiting, or associated with, certain zoophytes. On page 92 he stated that his discovery "must be the cause of extensive alterations and dismemberments in the Class ('Zoophytes') with which they have hitherto been associated", and later, "I shall merely mention here in a general way the whole of the Flustraceae, in many of which I have clearly ascertained the animals to be Polyzoae". He pointed out, in particular, that the species of the old genus *Sertularia* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) 1: 807, were some Hydroids and some Polyzoae. He described various members of the latter group, with reasonably good figures; and all the species thus indicated are definitely Polyzoa.

"Polyzoa" Thompson was thus neither introduced formally as a class nor as a genus.

In one place, however (and I do not know that this point has previously been brought out in discussions on the subject), he used the word in such a way that he may fairly be considered to have employed it as the name of a group. "POLYZOA", without qualification, appears as a heading of the explanation of his figures, on page 101; and it appears also as the heading of the alternate pages of his text. These facts, it may be argued, are a sufficient justification for the contention that "Polyzoa" was the name of a group; and his remarks, in the text, on the subject of classification strengthen the argument.

J. V. Thompson is, I think, the most striking example I know of really remarkable work being done by a man who may be described as an amateur naturalist. He was the first to describe the metamorphoses of Crustacea; and his five thin Memoirs contain a wealth of accurate information, far in advance of his time, particularly with regard to the metamorphoses of Crustacea, the description of specially interesting members of that group and with regard to the luminosity of the Ocean. The work of so distinguished a naturalist

deserves the recognition which would be given to it by accepting Polyzoa as the correct name for a very isolated group of animals:—a group which he was the first (with the possible exception of an earlier paper by Gray) to recognise as distinct.

I ought, lastly, to refer to a discussion of this question at the Linnean Society of London ("Proceedings" of Session 123, 1910–1911, pp. 61 *et seq.*). The opinions, on that occasion, were by no means unanimous. I also admit, finally, that "Bryozoa" is in more general use (except in this country) than "Polyzoa".

ON THE INTERPRETATION OF ARTICLE 19 OF THE RÈGLES INTERNATIONALES IN RELATION TO THE NAME *CHROMODORIS MCFARLANDI* COCKERELL, 1902 (CLASS GASTROPODA, ORDER OPISTHOBRANCHIA)

By D. P. COSTELLO.

(Department of Zoology, University of North Carolina.)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)122.)

Cockerell (1901; 1902) named and described three new species of the genus *Chromodoris* Alder & Hancock, 1855, *Mon. Brit. Nudibranch.* (Moll. 7 App. : xvii) on the basis of animals collected at San Pedro and La Jolla, California. These were :—*Chromodoris universitatis* Cockerell; *C. porterae* Cockerell; and *C. mcfarlandi*.

The first of these species was later considered to be identical with *Chromodoris californiensis* Bergh, 1879, *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philad.* 1879 (1) : 71 (see Cockerell, 1908, *Nautilus* 21 : 106; O'Donoghue, 1926, *Trans. Roy. Canad. Inst.* 15 : 199). According to O'Donoghue (1926), Bergh intended this species to be called *Chromodoris calensis*, and so named it in his manuscript plate. Later the term "*calensis*" was interpreted as a contraction for "*californiensis*", and so appeared in the text published in 1879 (not 1789, as misprinted in O'Donoghue's article). The trivial name *californiensis* has, therefore, been retained for this species by subsequent writers.

Cockerell (1902) states that *Chromodoris mcfarlandi* was named in honor of Professor F. M. MacFarland of Stanford University. The name of this investigator of the Nudibranchiata is F. M. MacFarland. MacFarland (1906) has corrected the spelling of his name, in as much as he refers to the species in question as *Chromodoris macfarlandi*, but no reference is made to the erroneous spelling in Cockerell's paper. The corrected spelling was also used by Cockerell (1908) and by O'Donoghue (1926). However, on the basis of the International Code of Nomenclature, and the same argument that was applied to *Chromodoris californiensis* Bergh, 1879, the trivial name *mcfarlandi* should stand unless modified by an *Opinion* of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

O'Donoghue, who has made an extensive study of the taxonomy of the Nudibranchiata, has indicated (1926) that the genus *Chromodoris* Alder & Hancock, 1855, should be changed to *Glossodoris* Ehrenberg, 1831, *Symbolae physicae* (Moll.) : sign. "f". Therefore, O'Donoghue considers that the correct name of the first species in question is *Glossodoris californiensis* (Bergh, 1879). The present name of the other species in question is *Glossodoris mcfarlandi* (Cockerell, 1902).

According to Article 19 of the International Code, the original orthography of a name is to be preserved unless an error of transcription, a *lapsus calami*, or a typographical error is evident. The error involved in the first use, by Cockerell, of *mcfarlandi* is probably not typographical, as it occurs in several places in two papers. It is possible, however, to consider it a *lapsus calami*. Judging from *Opinions* 41, 60, and 63, an *Opinion* by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature would be required to make the necessary change in this trivial name, i.e. the change from *mcfarlandi* to *macfarlandi*.

Literature cited

BERGH, R., 1879, "On the nudibranchiate gasteropod Mollusca of the North Pacific

- Ocean, with special reference to those of Alaska, Pt. I." *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philad.* **1879** (1) : 71.
- BERGH, R., 1880, "On the nudibranchiate gasteropod Mollusca of the North Pacific Ocean, with special reference to those of Alaska, Pt. II." *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philad.* **1880** : 40.
- COCKERELL, T. D. A., 1901, "Pigments of nudibranchiate Mollusca." *Nature* **65** : 79.
- , 1902, "Three new species of *Chromodoris*." *Nautilus* **16** : 19.
- , 1908, "Mollusca of La Jolla, California." *Nautilus* **21** : 106.
- MACFARLAND, F. M., 1906, "Opisthobranchiate Mollusca from Monterey Bay, California, and vicinity." *Bull. U.S. Bur. Fish.* **25** : 109.
- O'DONOGHUE, C. H., 1926, "A list of the nudibranchiate Mollusca recorded from the Pacific Coast of North America, with notes on their distribution." *Trans. Canad. Inst.* **15** : 199.

ON THE STATUS OF THE NAME COMMONLY CITED AS *PIROPLASMA ANNULATUM* DSCHUNKOWSKY AND LUHS, 1904 (CLASS SPOROZOA, ORDER COCCIDIIDA)

By G. WITENBERG.

(Department of Parasitology, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem.)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)127.)

Dschunkowsky and Luhs, 1904, *Zbl. Bakt.* (Erste Abt.) **35** : 486-492; in a paper entitled "Die Piroplasmosen der Rinder" described but did not name a disease of cattle in the Caucasus. In this article, reference is made to two "forms" of the parasite, one occurring in an "acute" form of the disease and the other in a "chronic" one. These authors later wrote of this species under the name *Piroplasma annulatum*, but it has not so far been possible to trace the paper in which this name was first so published.

Both the above "forms" of this parasite may now be distinguished as species, the one belonging to the genus *Theileria* Bettencourt, França, & Borges, 1907, *Arch. Inst. Bact. Camera Pestana* **1** : 343, the other to *Anaplasma* Theiler, 1910, *Bull. Soc. Path. exot.* **3** : 135. The *Theileria* species is apparently identical with a well-defined North African, namely *Theileria dispar* Ed. Sergent.

Ed. Sergent (1923, *Bull. Soc. Path. exot.* **16** : 23-30) expressed the view that the trivial name *annulatum* of Dschunkowsky and Luhs should not be recognised because the species so named by those authors is a "mixed species". Sergent considered that the species of *Theileria* described by the above authors under the above name might have been either of two species of that genus found in the Mediterranean area, one pathogenic and the other non-pathogenic. The pathogenic species Sergent incorrectly called *Theileria parva*, though in his later papers he replaced that name by the name *Theileria dispar*; the non-pathogenic species he called *Theileria mutans*.

However, the arguments advanced by Sergent cannot be accepted, for it is quite certain that there exists only one pathogenic species of the genus *Theileria* in the Mediterranean area. It seems, therefore, that the name *Theileria dispar* Sergent, should be regarded as a synonym of *Theileria annulata* (Dschunkowsky & Luhs, 1904) and not the contrary, as Sergent treats it in all his recent papers.

I should be much indebted for an *Opinion* on the question whether the rejection by Sergent of the trivial name *annulatum* Dschunkowsky & Luhs is in accordance with the provisions of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature.

ON THE QUESTION OF THE PLACE AND DATE OF FIRST PUBLICATION OF THE NAME *PIROPLASMA ANNULATUM* DSCHUNKOWSKY AND LUHS (CLASS SPOROZOA, ORDER COCCIDIIDA) COMMONLY TREATED AS HAVING BEEN FIRST PUBLISHED IN 1904

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)127.)

Since it is a condition of publication in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* that a full bibliographical reference should be given in any paper containing an application submitted to the International Commission for decision, I attempted, when preparing Dr. Witenberg's application for publication, to identify the paper in which it was stated in that application Dschunkowsky and Luhs had in 1904 first published the name *Piroplasma annulatum* (Class Sporozoa, Order Coccidiida). When, however, I consulted the paper published by those authors in 1904 under the title "Die Piroplasmosen der Rinder" (1904, *Zbl. Bakt.* (Erste Abt.) 35 : 486-492, pls.), I found that, although that paper was a preliminary communication, it contained a full description of the new species, but that nowhere did it contain a scientific name for it. Accordingly in September 1944, I wrote both to Dr. Witenberg and to Dr. C. M. Wenyon, C.M.G., C.B.E., F.R.S., The Wellcome Foundation, London, asking for assistance in this matter.

Dr. Wenyon replied (6th September 1944) saying that he was examining the literature and would write again as soon as his investigations were complete. On 11th October 1944, Dr. Wenyon reported as follows :—

We have made researches and have arrived at the following, which seems to be as far as we can go at present. If we get any more information, we will let you know.

We have been unable to trace the paper to which Dschunkowsky and Luhs's "Vorläufige Mitteilung" in the *Centralblatt*, 1904, was intended to be a preliminary. If it appeared at all, it is possible that it was in some obscure Russian journal. The earliest use we have discovered of the name *Piroplasma annulatum* (and there it is used as if it were already an accepted term) is in a paper read in the name of Dschunkowsky and Luhs by :—

TARTAKOWSKY [M. G.] (1906). [Remarks on Dschunkowsky and Luhs's observation on Piroplasmosis of Cattle in Trans-Caucasia.] *Report of the VIIIth International Veterinary Congress*, Budapest, 1905, Vol. III, p. 290.

The author appears as Herr Tartakowsky: we have taken his initials from the list of persons present (and on comparison with the rest, the "M" does not appear to stand for "Monsieur"). There is no title to his remarks; he is third speaker in a discussion on "Les maladies tropicales des animaux domestiques" and "Le rôle des protozoaires dans les maladies des animaux," and starts with the words: "Als Beitrag zu den bis jetzt erstatteten Referaten sei mir gestattet, im Namen des Herrn Dschunkowsky . . . unter seines Assistenten Herrn Luhs in kurzer Fassung einige Resultate ihrer Untersuchungen und Beobachtungen betreff der tropischen Rinderkrankheiten, welche in Transkaukasien verbreitet sind der Sektion mitzuteilen . . ."

Later, at the end of a list of names of diseases he gives:—"tropische Piroplasmose Dschunkowsky's und Luhs. Der Parasit: *Piroplasma annulatum*" [not in italics] . . . "Bemerkungswert ist, dass *Piroplasma annulatum* unter verschiedenen Umständen in drei Grundformen auftritt:

1. die Hauptform, kleine ring- und birnenförmige Parasiten;
2. lange und kleine bacillenartige Form;
3. punktförmige . . . P.-Sporen genannt.

In akuten Fällen beobachtet man die kleinen Ring- und Birnenformen im Sommer und P. Sporen im Winter. In dieser Hinsicht treten die Autoren von ihrer früheren Ansicht, dass die Punktform nur dem chronischen Verlauf der Krankheit eigen ist, zurück. In chronischen Fällen beobachtet man P.-Sporen im Winter und grosse bacillenartige Formen (3-5 μ) im Sommer . . ."

Immediately before Tartakowsky spoke, Herr Bitter (Cairo) concluded remarks he had made on Egyptian piroplasmosis with the words: "Es ist sehr wahrscheinlich, dass der Parasit identisch ist mit dem von Dschunkowsky und Luhs beschriebenen und ebenfalls auf dem Kongress demonstrierten Parasit."

Possibly Dschunkowsky and Luhs were present at the Congress and demonstrated their parasite, though in the discussion Tartakowsky spoke for them.

In a further letter dated 18th October 1944, Dr. Wenyon stated:—

We have now seen and examined very carefully the 1st and 2nd volumes of the *Report of the 8th International Veterinary Congress*, Budapest, 1905 (published in 1906) and can find no mention of any paper by Dschunkowsky and Luhs and no account of the description and demonstration mentioned by Bitter in vol. III.

I add two new references, unfortunately to journals which, according to the *World List of Scientific Periodicals*, are not available in this country:—

1. Dzhunkovskii, E. P. Tropical Piroplasmosis or African shore fever. *Prot. zash. Kavkask. med. obsh.*, Tiflis, 1903-4, XL, 742.
2. Dzhunkovskii, E., & Lus, I. Piroplasmosis of cattle. *Vestnik obsch. vet.*, St. Petersburg, 1903, XV, 769.

The second of the above papers is quoted twice by Laveran, A., (1906) in "Tropische Krankheiten der Haustiere," *Rep. 8th Internat. Vet. Congr.*, Budapest, 1905, under the spelling "Dschunkowsky & Luhs" and the date "Sept. 1904."

On 25th October 1944 I received from Dr. Witenberg the following letter dated 15th October 1944:—

Referring to the publication in which *Piroplasma annulatum* was first proposed, I am sorry to say that I was not able to trace it. I corresponded with Dschunkowsky on this question but he was not able to help. I quote below a translation of a part of his letter of 13th July 1938, which contains hints in the matter:—" . . . in the same year (1903) I published, together with my collaborator, the late I. Luhs, a preliminary note in a small Russian journal, possibly '*Veterinariii Vrach.*' In 1904 I reported on this species in the International Congress in Budapest . . ."

On receipt of the above letter, I consulted Mr. D. A. E. Cabot, Chief Veterinary Officer, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, London, who (in a letter dated 22nd November 1944) informed me that the Imperial Bureau of Animal Health had located copies of the journals containing the papers referred to by Dr. Wenyon in his letter of 18th October and were seeking to obtain microfilms of these papers, in order to ascertain whether the name *Piroplasma annulatum*

had been published in either of them. These microfilms have not yet been obtained and, if any specialist reading the present note has access to either of these papers, it will be of great assistance to the Commission if he will be so good as to furnish them with information on the above subject.

It will be seen from the foregoing particulars that it has not yet been possible to trace the original reference for the name *Piroplasma annulatum* or even to determine whether it was first published by Dschunkowsky alone or by that author jointly with Luhs. The fact that these questions have not yet been finally determined fortunately does not mean that there need be any delay in reaching a decision on the problem submitted by Dr. Witenberg, since the question raised in Dr. Witenberg's application is one of principle and is not dependent upon the exact manner in which the name *Piroplasma annulatum* was first published.

PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE RÈGLES FOR TREMATASPIS SCHMIDT, 1866 (CLASS CEPHALASPIDOMORPHI, ORDER OSTEOSTRACI)

By GEORGE M. ROBERTSON.

(Department of Biology, Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire.)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)123.)

I wish to submit to the Commission the problem of nomenclature of the Ostracoderm genus *Tremataspis* Schmidt, 1866, *Verh. Russ. min. Ges.*, St. Petersburg. (2) 1: 233, asking for suspension of the rules on the grounds that more confusion would result from their application than from setting them aside.

In 1856 Pander (1) described as a new species *Cephalaspis schrenckii* from the Upper Silurian of Oesel. Ten years later, F. Schmidt (2), having acquired a few specimens from the same locality, and regarding them as conspecific with Pander's species, founded the genus *Tremataspis* Schmidt. Since he regarded his material as conspecific with Pander's *Cephalaspis schrenckii*, he adopted the trivial name *schrenckii*. He was unable at that time to find the specimens on which Pander's species had been based.

By 1892, when J. V. Rohon (3) published an extensive account of *Tremataspis* Schmidt, three specimens of the Pander species had been discovered. Rohon found them specifically distinct from the specimens which Schmidt had described. He, therefore, gave Schmidt's material the name *Tremataspis schmidtii* and left Pander's species as *Tremataspis schrenckii*.

The taxonomic error came with the next publication by Schmidt (4). In this he recognised the validity of Rohon's distinction between his and Pander's material, but restored Pander's to *Cephalaspis schrenckii*. As I understand these matters, a genus is not founded on a specimen or on specimens, but on a species. One cannot, then, legitimately remove a type species from a genus without reducing the generic name to the synonymy. Since Pander's species was the type of *Tremataspis* Schmidt, that name should have been relegated to synonymy, i.e. should have followed its type species. Schmidt's material should not have been left as *Tremataspis schmidtii* Rohon but should have been given a new generic name.

In Rohon's next contribution (5) to the literature on *Tremataspis*, he agreed with Schmidt in removing the *schrenckii* species from the genus *Tremataspis* and proceeded to discuss the TREMATASPIDAE, overlooking the taxonomic error.

This tangled nomenclature has escaped the notice of all who have dealt with *Tremataspis* or with "*Cephalaspis schrenckii*", the latest offender being the present writer (6). However, in working through the material in the Patten collection at Dartmouth College, I discovered 57 specimens of the Pander species. Examination of these specimens demonstrated to my satisfaction that the species represented a genus of its own. I proceeded to describe it and give it a new generic name, *Witaaspis*, from the quarry near Rotsiküllä in which the fossils were found. The manuscript was submitted to Dr. Romer of Harvard. In looking over the account, he discovered the infraction of taxonomic rules and kindly called my attention to it.

If taxonomic procedure is to be followed, the Pander species, instead of receiving a new generic name, should once more become *Tremataspis schrenckii*, while the various species now known as *Tremataspis* should be given a different generic name.

Schmidt and Rohon identified a number of Pander's other species with *Tremataspis schmidtii*. These other species Pander had founded on small fragments of shields. Their microscopic structure, as seen in thin sections, resembles that of *Tremataspis* shields. However, they do not seem to me to resemble *Tremataspis* any more closely than they do *Cephalaspis*, and, since a number of genera of Osteostraci occur together in the formation, it is not sufficiently established that these Pander fragments belong to one rather than to some other of these genera. I would question their identification as *Tremataspis* too much to regard them as possible genotypes, whose generic designation should replace *Tremataspis*.

In the International Code, there is a provision made for suspension of the rules in certain cases.³ In the present instance, it seems to me that the inconvenience which would result from adherence to the rules would more than offset the advantage resulting from correcting Schmidt's error. The designation "*Tremataspis*" has attached to the polished shields from Oesel for some 72 years. To redescribe Pander's "*Cephalaspis schrenckii*" as *Tremataspis* and to change the genus and family names of what we have known as *Tremataspis* to something different only makes for confusion.

It appears to the writer that in this case we have a very good instance in which "the strict application of the rules will clearly result in greater confusion than uniformity".³ I, therefore, suggest that the rules be suspended in this case, leaving us the well-established *Tremataspis* with *Tremataspis schmidtii* Rohon as the genotype, and giving the Pander species the new generic name *Witaaspis* Robertson, 1939, *J. Geol.* **47** (6) : 652.

References.

1. PANDER, C., 1856, "Monographie der fossilen Fische des Silurischen Systems der Russischen-baltischen Gouvernements," St. Petersburg. : 47 pl. 4 fig. 2.
2. SCHMIDT, F., 1866, "Ueber *Thyestes verrucosus* Eichwald und *Cephalaspis schrenckii* Pander, nebst einer Einleitung über das Vorkommen silurischer Fischreste auf der Insel Oesel." *Verh. russ. min. Ges. St. Petersburg.* (2) **1**.
3. ROHON, J. V., 1892, "Die Obersilurische Fische von Oesel. I Theil. *Thyestidae* und *Tremataspidae*." *Mem. Acad. imp. Sci. St. Petersburg.* (7) **33** (13) : 61.
4. SCHMIDT, F., 1893, "Ueber neue silurische Fischfunde auf Oesel." *Neues Jahrb. für Mineralogie* **1** : 99.
5. ROHON, J. V., 1894, "Zur Kenntniss der Tremataspiden." *Mel. Geol. et Pal. Bull. Acad. imp. Sci. St. Petersburg.* **1**.
6. ROBERTSON, G. M., 1938, "The Tremataspidae." *Amer. J. Sci.* (4) **35** : 172-206, 273-296.

³ See Declaration 5 (1943, *Opinions and Declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* **1** : 31-40).

PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE RÈGLES TO IDENTIFY *ANOMIA PECTEN* LINNAEUS, 1758, WITH THE SPECIES BELONGING TO THE ORDER PROTREMATA (CLASS BRACHIOPODA) COMMONLY KNOWN AS *STROPHOMENA PECTEN* (LINNAEUS, 1758)

By ALAN WOOD, Ph.D.

(Department of Geology, Imperial College of Science and Technology, London.)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)130.)

Linnaeus, in 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) 1 : 702, described a fossil shell under the name *Anomia pecten* in the following words :—

103. A. testa semi-orbiculata depressa multistriata : valvula altera plana.

List. angl. 243. t. 9. f. 49.

Habitat . . . fossilis.

Testa inferne s. margine cardinis linea recta s. transversa.

No locality was given by Linnaeus, as will be seen from the above quotation, but a specimen is contained in his cabinet at the Linnean Society of London.

Lister's figure, cited by Linnaeus, is of a specimen "ex fodinis carbonum Fossilium juxta Hallifax", and is quite recognisable as the lamellibranch *Dunbarella papyracea* (J. Sowerby, 1822) (= *Pecten papyraceus* Sowerby, 1822, *Min. Conch.* 4 : 75 pl. 354), which is known to occur in the Halifax Hard Marine Band in the Coal Measures. This is the species widely known as *Pterinopecten papyraceus* (Sowerby, 1822). The description given by Linnaeus quoted above could be held to apply to this shell.

On the other hand, the shell preserved in the Linnean cabinet is a Silurian brachiopod to which the name *Strophomena pecten* (Linnaeus, 1758) has long been given. *This is the species now known as *Schuchertella pecten* (Linnaeus, 1758). This Silurian form is the shell with which Linnaeus was actually dealing, and knowledge of its characteristics was spread by personal contact among Swedish palaeontologists, till Dalman in 1828 (*K. Vet. Akad. Handl.* 1827) published typical figures.

By strict application of the rules, it would seem that the trivial name *papyraceus* Sowerby should be displaced by *pecten* Linnaeus, and that the brachiopod long known as *Strophomena pecten* (Linnaeus, 1758) is without a valid trivial name.

Since both *Pterinopecten papyraceus* (Sowerby, 1822) and *Strophomena pecten* (Linnaeus, 1758) are widely distributed shells, cited by many authors for more than 100 years, strict application of the rules in this case would lead to confusion. It is, therefore, asked that the rules be suspended in this case, so that the trivial name *pecten* Linnaeus, 1758, can be applied to the Silurian brachiopod now commonly known as *Strophomena pecten* (Linnaeus, 1758).

ON THE TYPE OF THE GENUS *CHINCHILLA* BENNETT, 1829 (CLASS MAMMALIA, ORDER RODENTIA)

By WILFRED H. OSGOOD.

(Chicago Natural History Museum.)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)141.)

Is *Mus laniger* Molina, 1782, necessarily the type of *Chinchilla* Bennett, 1829, under the rules? If not, is the type to be determined as the next valid or invalid name definitely applied to the species described by Bennett and referred to the genus?

The facts are as follows:—

Mus laniger Molina, 1782 (*Saggio Stor. nat. Chili*: 301–302, 342) was described from tales of natives, notes and memories, after its describer had left Chile. There is no evidence that any specimens were in the author's hands at the time of writing nor at any other time. Since he coupled the native name "chinchilla" with it, it was accepted by various authors prior to 1829, who supposed it referred to the fur-bearing rodent then known in Europe only by incomplete market skins. In 1829 Bennett received complete specimens of the animal and observed living examples in the London zoo. He determined these to represent a new genus which he fully described and figured (*Gardens and Menag. Zool. Soc. Lond.* 1: 1–12, October 1829). His account, although thorough and detailed, was semi-popular in nature and a more technical and more fully illustrated treatment was later issued (1833, *Trans. zool. Soc. Lond.* 1: 35–64 pls. 5, 7), in which he characterised the family CHINCHILLIDÆ. His first paper bears a good woodcut of several chinchillas, beneath which is the heading: "THE CHINCHILLA *Chinchilla lanigera*". Then follows a historical account and detailed description. No other trivial name is mentioned and, although the name *laniger* is changed to the feminine form *lanigera* without coupling Molina with it as authority, there is no doubt that Bennett assumed that Molina's species was the same as the one that he had in mind. In doing this, he may have been influenced by the general acceptance of the name by other authors, for he was clearly aware that Molina's description was defective. This is evidenced by the following extracts from his text: (: 2) "the description given in his work added little of truth and much of error"; (: 5) "it is impossible to place in his descriptions that implicit confidence to which his acknowledged good faith would otherwise entitle him"; (: 7) "we have thus fortunately placed within our reach the means of correcting many of the errors into which former writers have fallen with regard to it". These statements apparently do not justify the assumption that Molina's species was "doubtfully referred" or that it was a "species inquirenda" from Bennett's standpoint, but they seem to border on it and perhaps deserve some consideration in judging the case.

Authors subsequent to Bennett, with some exceptions (*e.g.* Lichtenstein), have followed him in accepting Molina's name for the chinchilla, and the generic name *Chinchilla*, with the family name CHINCHILLIDÆ derived from it, has been current in literature. In some cases (*e.g.* Palmer, 1904, *Faun. N. Amer.* 23: 181, 844) the *Mus laniger* of Molina is definitely stated to be the type of the genus *Chinchilla* Bennett. No very critical examination of Molina's description appeared until 1934, when Prell (*Zool. Garten* 7: 207) carefully analysed it and concluded that it does not apply to the true chinchilla but to

the so-called false chinchilla or chinchilla rat, an animal belonging to a different genus (*Abrocoma* Waterhouse, 1837, *Proc. zool. Soc. Lond.* 5 (50) : 30) and family. Whether this be true or not, Prell makes it quite clear that the description does not apply to the chinchilla. Only two conclusions are possible in regard to it. Either it is applicable to the genus now called *Abrocoma* as Prell believed, or it is composite and unidentifiable, as seems evident to others. Therefore, if it is properly the type of the genus *Chinchilla* Bennett, it will be necessary either to transfer that name to what has been called *Abrocoma* or to suppress it as based on an unidentifiable species.

It is to be noted that Bennett did not designate *Mus laniger* as the type of *Chinchilla*. In fact it is clear that the genus was based only on his specimens and his remarks are specific to the effect that, until the specimens were available, the generic determination of Molina's supposed species was impossible. Subsequent authors who have cited *Mus laniger* as the type of *Chinchilla* Bennett obviously did so because it was the only name mentioned by Bennett, and few if any ever consulted Molina's text.

What Bennett actually did was to provide a generic name for an animal not previously named either as species or genus. His assumption that Molina's *Mus laniger* referred to the same animal is decidedly qualified; therefore, subsequent designation of *Mus laniger* as the type of his genus is at most doubtfully justified. The genus was monotypic from Bennett's standpoint and, although three forms (Chilean, Peruvian and Bolivian) are now recognised, they are so closely related that subspecific status for all of them is not improbable. However this may be, it is obvious that the type must be a name based on the animal described by Bennett, that is, the Chilean form as at present understood. This excludes the first specific name properly applied to a true chinchilla which is *Eriomys chinchilla* Lichtenstein, 1829 (*Darst. neu. o. wenig. bekannt. Saugth.* 2 pp., pl. 28) based on the Peruvian form. *Eriomys* Lichtenstein, 1829, therefore is a synonym of *Chinchilla* Bennett, 1829,* and the trivial name *chinchilla* Lichtenstein is valid for the Peruvian form but not available as type of the genus *Chinchilla* Bennett, in spite of the tautonymy. The combination *Cricetus chinchilla* was used by Fischer in 1814 (*Zoognosia* (ed. 3) 3 : 55) but only as a substitute for *Mus laniger* and it does affect the later use of the trivial name *chinchilla* by Lichtenstein for a species not congeneric with *Mus laniger* Molina.

Owing to the continued mistaken use of the trivial name *laniger*, the Chilean chinchilla had no other name applied to it until 1934, when Prell (*Zool. Anz.* 108 : 100) called it *Chinchilla velligera* and plainly stated that the name was intended to apply to the animal described by Bennett. This, therefore, is the only name providing the requirements for a type for the genus *Chinchilla* Bennett, if *Mus laniger* Molina is removed from consideration. It might be contended that the type should be the species first referred to the genus after its characterisation (see *Opinion* 46). This, however, would bring us to a

* Evidence is not wholly conclusive as to the priority of *Chinchilla* Bennett, 1829, over *Eriomys* Lichtenstein, 1829,⁴ but the first author to consider the question (Waterhouse, 1848, *Nat. Hist. Mamm.* 2 : 233, footnote) has definitely given preference to *Chinchilla* Bennett on the grounds that its description is more complete and more accurate. An earlier reference to Bennett's is found in the number for January 1829 of the *Zoological Journal* (4 : 317), where Yarrell uses only the vernacular name "chinchilla" but significantly places a question mark after the name *Mus laniger* Molina, which he refers to it, thus indicating the uncertainty about this name which prevailed at the time.

⁴ According to Neave, 1939, *Nomencl. zool.* 2 : 285, the correct date of publication of the name *Eriomys* Lichtenstein is 1830 not 1829.

species (or subspecies?) "not included under the generic name at the time of its original publication" (i.e. the Peruvian form rather than the Chilean), for in this case it is plainly evident what species is involved even though it had not at the time received a name. Theoretically or nomenclatorially, it must be assumed that the Chilean and Peruvian forms are different species.

If *Mus laniger* Molina be suppressed or excluded as a possible type of *Chinchilla* Bennett, considerable confusion would be avoided. In fact, nothing would be lost except the trivial name *laniger*. The happy combination *Chinchilla chinchilla* would remain for the Peruvian form and the family name CHINCHILLIDAE would stand as at present. The Chilean form, if ever proved to be only subspecifically different from the Peruvian, would be *Chinchilla chinchilla velligera* Prell, 1934.

On the other hand, if it be attempted to make *Mus laniger* Molina the type, the name *Chinchilla* Bennett might be transferred to *Abrocoma* Waterhouse, 1837 (which would pass out), and the true chinchillas apparently take the name *Eriomys* Lichtenstein. A new family name would also be needed and there would be long-continued confusion of technical and vernacular names. The question whether or not *Mus laniger* Molina is identifiable would remain to plague, and both *Chinchilla* Bennett and *Abrocoma* Waterhouse (perhaps some others also) would be affected.

Whether or not Molina's *Mus laniger* is identifiable is perhaps not a question for action by the Commission. The question at issue, then, seems to be this. Assuming that *Mus laniger* Molina, 1782, is unidentifiable, what is the type of *Chinchilla* Bennett, 1829?

ON THE STATUS OF THE NAME *ATUROIDEA* VREDENBURG, 1925 (CLASS CEPHALOPODA, ORDER NAUTILOIDEA)

By M. H. HAAS, Ph.D., LL.D.

(Department of Geology, British Museum (Natural History).)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)139.)

I beg to submit the following case for examination :—

- (1) The name *Aturoidea* was created by Vredenburg, 1925, *Mem. geol. Surv. India* 1 : 9 in the following words :—

These three species [scil. *Nautilus parkinsoni* Edwards, *N. spathi* Vredemb. and *N. serpentinus* Blanford] lack the funnel shaped septal sheaths round the siphuncle characteristic of *Aturia* and may be referred to a section "*Aturoidea*" of *Nautilus*.

- (2) The name *Paraturia* was created by Spath, 1927, *Pal. ind.* (n.s.) 9 (Mem. No. 4) : 22 for a genus of the family HERCOGLOSSIDAE with *Nautilus parkinsoni* Edwards as its genotype. Spath specified :—

The forms with more angular sutures and an entomarginal siphuncle, like *Nautilus parkinsoni* Edwards, *Hercoglossa paucifex* (Cope) Whitfield . . . both of which are genoparatypes of *Hercoglossa*, further *Nautilus schweinfurthi* (Zittel MS.) Quaas are here referred to the new genus *Paraturia*.

- (3) Dr. G. de P. Cotter, when editing Vredenburg's posthumous MS. (Cotter, 1928, in Vredenburg, *Pal. ind.* (n.s.) 10 (Mem. No. 4) : 18 :—

(a) at first adopted Spath's generic name, adding the following footnote :—

In Mr. Vredenburg's manuscript a new name was proposed for this section of Nautiloids, but quite recently Dr. Spath ("Revision of the Jurassic Cephalopod Fauna of Kacch (Cutch)", Mem. 2, p. 22, 1927) separated this form under the subgeneric designation of *Paraturia*, which, therefore, replaces the name suggested by Mr. Vredenburg.

- (b) but later, yet still before the publication of this paper, he rectified his opinion and substituted, both in the specific description of *Nautilus spathi* Vredenburg and in the generic (subgeneric) diagnosis, the name *Aturoidea* for the name *Paraturia* and replaced the footnote quoted above by the following :—

The name *Paraturia* was proposed by Dr. Spath for this section of Nautiloids in 1927 (Revision of the Jurassic Cephalopoda of Kacch, *Pal. Ind.*, Vol. IX., Mem. 2, p. 22) but the name *Aturoidea* has the priority, having been first suggested by Mr. Vredenburg in 1925 (see Memoirs of the Geological Survey of India, Vol. 1, page 9).

- (4) Spath, 1929, *Naturalist* 1929 : 269, approved the latter point of view, saying :—

Aturoidea Vredenburg, 1925 (Mem. geol. Survey, Vol. 1, pt. 1, p. 9) antedates *Paraturia* Spath, 1927 (*Pal. Indica*, N.S., Vol. IX., Mem. No. 2, pt. 1, 26th January 1927, p. 22).

- (5) Subsequently (1931, *Bull. Dep. geol. Sci. Univ. Calif.* 19 : 435) Schenck agreed to this solution, though he quoted a wrong paper of Spath's for the establishment of the name *Paraturia*. This solution was agreed to also by Miller and Thompson in 1933 (*J. Paleont.* 7 : 298) and 1935 (*ibid.* 9 (7) : 563). In the second of these papers Miller and Thompson explicitly
BULL. ZOOL. NOMENCL. (FEB. 1947.)

designated *Nautilus parkinsoni* Edwards as genoelectotype of *Aturoidea* Vredenburg, 1925.

In my opinion, the name *Paraturia* Spath ought not to have given way to the name *Aturoidea* Vredenburg, for the following reasons: That Vredenburg omitted to designate a genotype would not have made invalid the establishment of a genus (subgenus), since his paper appeared in 1925 (International Code Article 25).⁵ But, as he used the indefinite expression "section" (instead of "genus" or "subgenus"), it must be doubted whether there was, in fact, established a genus (subgenus) *Aturoidea* Vredenburg, 1925. It may also be doubtful whether Vredenburg intended to establish a new genus, in view of the fact that he used the expression "section" and the termination "...-oidea" often used for Classes. Further, it seems as if Vredenburg would have had in view the word *Aturoidea* as neuter plural but not a feminine singular; that also would exclude the intention of formally establishing a genus (subgenus) (*Aturoidea*).⁶ Spath, on the other hand, doubtless did have such an intention, since he established his genus *Paraturia* within a new classification of the post-triassic Nautiloidea and explicitly designated *B. parkinsoni* Edwards as genotype.

Since Spath himself has already in a published paper acknowledged the priority of *Aturoidea* Vredenburg over *Paraturia* Spath and other authors—though not having thoroughly examined the matter—have followed him, the question arises whether, notwithstanding the objections set out above, there would not result greater confusion than uniformity if the name *Aturoidea* Vredenburg were cancelled and its place taken by *Paraturia* Spath.

I, therefore, beg to request the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to decide:—

- (a) whether the creation of the name *Aturoidea* by Vredenburg in 1925 is to be acknowledged as being in accordance with the rules and the name *Aturoidea* Vredenburg consequently accepted as an available name for a genus (or subgenus); and if not,
- (b) whether the name *Aturoidea* Vredenburg, 1925, should be retained under suspension of the rules and the name *Paraturia* Spath, 1927, sunk as a synonym.

⁵ The amendment to Article 25 of the Code adopted by the Tenth International Congress of Zoology at Budapest in 1927 did not come into operation until midnight 31st December 1930/1st January 1931. Accordingly, the name *Aturoidea* Vredenburg, published five years earlier (in 1925), is not invalid by reason of no type having been designated by its original author. For the text of the Budapest amendment to Article 25, see NOTE 3 to *Opinion 1* (1944, *Opinions and Declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 1: 76–78).

⁶ The status of generic (and subgeneric) names published otherwise than in the nominative singular has been dealt with by the International Commission in *Opinion 183* (see 1944, *Opinions and Declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 3: 13–24).

ON THE TYPES OF THE GENERA *BRADYCELLUS* ERICHSON, 1837,
AND *TRICHOCELLUS* GANGLBAUER, 1892 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER
COLEOPTERA)

By H. E. ANDREWES.

(Leicester.)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)158.)

Bradycellus Erichson.

Erichson, 1837, *Käf. Mark Brand.* 1 (1) : 64.

Westwood, 1838, *Syn. gen. Brit. Ins.* : 5.

Hope, 1838, *Col. Man.* 2 : 89.

Andrewes, 1935, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (10) 16 : 20.

Both Westwood and Hope cited as type *Harpalus placidus* Gyll., 1827, and, after showing in my paper quoted above, what great confusion in our present nomenclature would arise if this citation were allowed to stand, I proposed *Carabus collaris* Payk. as a substitute. An *Opinion* of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is required to confirm this action.

Trichocellus Ganglbauer.

Ganglbauer, 1892, *Käf. Mitteleur.* 1 : 365-6.

Andrewes, 1934, *Ent. mon. Mag.* 70 : 201.

Andrewes, 1935, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (10) 16 : 20.

Harpalus placidus Gyll. was cited by both Westwood and Hope as the type of the genus *Bradycellus* Erichson, and the arguments in favour of its supersession by *Carabus collaris* Payk., and its adoption as the type of *Trichocellus* Ganglbauer, have already been set forth in my two papers quoted above.⁷

⁷ The above is an extract from the paper entitled "The generic names of the British CARABIDAE" prepared by Mr. H. E. Andrewes for the Coleoptera Sub-Committee of the Committee on Generic Nomenclature of the Royal Entomological Society of London. At the date in question the composition of the above Sub-Committee and of the above Committee was as shown in footnote 8 below.

PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE RÈGLES FOR *BRADYCELLUS*
ERICHSON, 1837 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER COLEOPTERA)

By SIR GUY A. K. MARSHALL, K.C.M.G., D.Sc., F.R.S.

(formerly Director, Imperial Institute of Entomology, London),

H. E. ANDREWES

(Leicester),

W. A. F. BALFOUR-BROWNE

(formerly Professor of Entomology, Department of Entomology, Imperial College of Science and Technology, London),

K. G. BLAIR, D.Sc.

(formerly Deputy Keeper of the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History)),

and

M. CAMERON.

(British Museum (Natural History), Zoological Museum, Tring).

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)158.)

In the case of the following generic name the strict application of the rules embodied in the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature would cause a serious, and quite unnecessary, disturbance in existing practice and would, in our view, cause greater confusion than uniformity. For this name we are in favour of a partial suspension of the rules. The object we have in view can be effected by a very slight departure from the strict application of the Code.

The portion of Mr. Andrewes' paper relating to this name and to the name *Trichocellus* Ganglbauer, 1892, which is bound up in the same problem, was written by him in consultation with us, and we are in full agreement both with his conclusions and with his recommendations, which we summarise as follows:—

THE GENERIC NAMES *BRADYCELLUS* ERICHSON, 1837, AND *TRICHOCELLUS*
GANGLBAUER, 1892.

Westwood, 1838, and Hope, 1838-39, both cited *Harpalus placidus* Gyllenhal, 1827, as type of *Bradycellus*. Seidlitz, however, 1887, proposed a new genus *Tachycellus* for *Harpalus placidus* Gyllenhal, 1827, and *H. cognatus* Gyllenhal, 1827, but, this name being pre-occupied, Ganglbauer, 1892, substituted for it *Trichocellus*, for which Andrewes, 1934, specified *H. placidus* as the type.

In order to avoid the confusion that would ensue were Westwood's type citation maintained, Andrewes, 1935, formally cited *Carabus collaris* Paykull, 1798, as type of *Bradycellus*, thus stabilising present usage in adopting the procedure followed by Seidlitz, Ganglbauer, Reitter and all modern writers.

It is very desirable that this action be confirmed and an *Opinion* promulgated that Westwood's and Hope's citations be over-ruled and that *C. collaris* Paykull be specified as the genotype of *Bradycellus* Erichson, *H. placidus* Gyllenhal serving as the genotype of *Trichocellus* Ganglbauer.

We are therefore of the opinion that in the exercise of the plenary power conferred upon them by the International Zoological Congress the International

Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should as soon as possible take the steps laid down by the Congress for the promulgation of an *Opinion* to the following effect :—

The name *Bradycellus* Erichson, 1837 (type *Carabus collaris* Paykull, 1798), is added to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*. The designation by Westwood of *Harpalus placidus* Gyllenhal, 1827, as the type of *Bradycellus* is therefore to be set aside, and that by Andrewes, 1935, of *Carabus collaris* Paykull is to be accepted.⁸

ON THE TYPE OF THE GENUS *CARABUS* LINNAEUS, 1758 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER COLEOPTERA)

By H. E. ANDREWES.

(Leicester.)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)158.)

Carabus Linnaeus, 1758.

- Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) 1 : 413.
- Latreille, 1810, *Consid. gén. Anim. Crust. Arach. Ins.* : 426.
- Curtis, 1833, *Brit. Ent.* 10 : pl. 446.
- Hope, 1838, *Col. Man.* 2 : 47.
- Solier, 1848, in Truqui and Baudi, *Studi Ent.* 1 : 58.
- C. G. Thomson, 1875, *Opusc. Ent.* 7 : 640.
- Andrewes, 1935, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (10) 16 : 14.
- Breuning, 1932-1937, *Best.-Tab. Europ. Col.* 104-110.

Latreille cited as type *Carabus auratus* Fab., 1801 (= Linn., 1761), a species not originally mentioned by Linnaeus, so that the citation is invalid. Curtis, 1833, and Westwood, 1838, made *Carabus violaceus* Linn. the type. C. G. Thomson divided the genus into a number of subgenera, and, following Hope, made *C. granulatus* Linn. the type of his subgenus *Carabus* s.s. Most recent writers, including Breuning in his revision quoted above, also treat *C. granulatus* Linn. as the genotype. For the reasons given in my recent paper, it is very desirable that the International Commission should express an *Opinion* confirming Hope's citation and overruling that of Curtis.⁹

⁸ The above is an extract from the First Report of the Coleoptera Sub-Committee of the Committee on Generic Nomenclature of the Royal Entomological Society of London. At the time of the submission of the above Report, the Coleoptera Sub-Committee was composed as follows :—Sir Guy Marshall, C.M.G., F.R.S. (*Chairman*), Mr. H. E. Andrewes, Professor W. A. F. Balfour-Browne, Dr. K. G. Blair, and Commander M. Cameron, R.N. At the same period the Committee on Generic Nomenclature was composed as follows :—Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Chairman*), Dr. K. G. Blair, Dr. F. W. Edwards, F.R.S., Dr. O. W. Richards, Mr. N. D. Riley, and Professor W. A. F. Balfour-Browne (*Hon. Secretary*). On receiving the Sub-Committee's Report, the Committee on Generic Nomenclature, in their Sixth Report, recommended the Council of the Royal Entomological Society of London to transmit the Coleoptera Sub-Committee's recommendations to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for favourable consideration. This recommendation was approved by the Council and, on the publication of the Committee's Sixth Report by the Society on 15th December 1939, the Sub-Committee's recommendations were forwarded to the International Commission by the Council of the Society.

⁹ See footnote 7 above.

**PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE RÈGLES FOR *CARABUS* LINNAEUS,
1758 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER COLEOPTERA)**

By SIR GUY A. K. MARSHALL, K.C.M.G., D.Sc., F.R.S.
(formerly Director, Imperial Institute of Entomology, London),

H. E. ANDREWES
(Leicester),

W. A. F. BALFOUR-BROWNE
(formerly Professor of Entomology, Imperial College of Science and Technology, London),

K. G. BLAIR, D.Sc.
(formerly Deputy Keeper of the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History)).
and

M. CAMERON.
(British Museum (Natural History), Zoological Museum, Tring).

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)158.)

In the case of the following generic name the strict application of the rules embodied in the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature would cause a serious, and quite unnecessary, disturbance in existing practice and would, in our view, cause greater confusion than uniformity. For this name we are in favour of a partial suspension of the rules. The object we have in view can be effected by a very slight departure from the strict application of the Code.

The portion of Mr. Andrewes' paper relating to this name was written by him in consultation with us, and we are in full agreement both with his conclusions and with his recommendations, which we summarise as follows :—

THE GENERIC NAME *CARABUS* LINNAEUS, 1758.

The first valid type-citation is that of *Carabus violaceus* Linnaeus, 1758, by Curtis, 1833. Hope, 1838, cited *Carabus granulatus* Linnaeus, 1758, and C. G. Thomson, 1875, in his revision of the genus, made this the type of the subgenus *Carabus* s.s.; in this action he has been followed by all subsequent writers. To maintain Curtis' citation would cause considerable confusion in the subgenera of this genus, with a profuse literature, so that it is very desirable that this citation should be set aside in favour of that of Hope.

We are therefore of the opinion that in the exercise of the plenary power conferred upon them by the International Zoological Congress the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should as soon as possible take the steps laid down by the Congress for the promulgation of an *Opinion* to the following effect :—

The name *Carabus* Linnaeus, 1758 (type *Carabus granulatus* Linnaeus), is added to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*. The designation by Curtis, 1833, of *Carabus violaceus* Linnaeus as the type is therefore to be set aside, and that by Hope, 1838, of *Carabus granulatus* Linnaeus is to be accepted.¹⁰

¹⁰ See footnote 8 above.

ON THE TYPES OF THE GENERA *HARPALUS* LATREILLE, [1802-1803]
AND *OPHONUS* STEPHENS, 1827 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER COLEO-
PTERA)

By H. E. ANDREWES.

(Leicester.)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)158.)

Harpalus Latreille

Latreille, [1802-1803],¹¹ (in Sonnini's Buffon), *Hist. nat. gén. partic. Crust. Ins.* 3 : 92.

Latreille, 1810, *Consid. gén. Anim. Crust. Arach. Ins.* : 426.

Curtis, 1827, *Brit. Ent.* 4 : pl. 191 (*Ophonus*).

Westwood, 1838, *Syn. gen. Brit. Ins.* : 4 (*Ophonus*).

Hope, 1838, *Col. Man.* 2 : 84.

Andrewes, 1935, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (10) 16 : 18.

Note 1.—Latreille (1810) cited as type *Carabus ruficornis* Fab., 1775 (= *Carabus rufipes* Degeer, 1774), and in my paper, quoted above, I have pointed out (i) the great disorganisation which would ensue in the present system of nomenclature if this citation were allowed to stand, and (ii) the consequent advantages which would follow the adoption of *Carabus affinis* Schrank (= *aeneus* Fabricius) as the genotype. Fabricius refers to *aeneus* three times : (i) 1775, *Syst. Ent.* : 245, (ii) 1792, *Ent. syst.* 1 (1) : 156, and (iii) 1801, *Syst. Eleuth.* 1 : 197, but (iii) is merely a reproduction of (ii). The descriptions given in numbers (i) and (ii) do not quite agree, and in the latter there is no reference to the prior description. In my paper I had assumed the accuracy of Csiki's Catalogue, but on the whole it seems best to treat the two descriptions as referring to the same species, unless and until an examination of the types proves this assumption to be inaccurate. In these circumstances it seems desirable to apply to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for an *Opinion* setting aside the type fixation by Latreille.

Note 2.—*Ophonus* Steph. (1st Nov. 1827, key only) is now generally regarded as a subgenus of *Harpalus*. Curtis (1st Dec. 1827) first actually described the genus, citing as type *Carabus germanus* Linn., 1758; Westwood (1838) designated it as *Carabus obscurus* Fab., 1792. Here again great confusion would be caused by the acceptance of Curtis' citation, and, as suggested in my paper quoted above, I propose that it should be set aside in favour of that of Westwood.¹²

¹¹ Griffin (1938, *J. Soc. Bibl. nat. Hist.* 1 : 157) has shown that, notwithstanding the fact that the title-page of the volume in which the name *Harpalus* Latreille was published bears the date "An X" of the French Revolutionary Calendar (i.e. Sept. 1801-Sept. 1802), that volume was not in fact published until some time in "An XI" (i.e. Sept. 1802-Sept. 1803). See also footnote 7 on page 205 above.

¹² See footnote 7 above.

**PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE RÈGLES FOR *HARPALUS* LATREILLE,
[1802-1803] AND *OPHONUS* STEPHENS, 1827 (CLASS INSECTA,
ORDER COLEOPTERA)**

By SIR GUY A. K. MARSHALL, K.C.M.G., D.Sc., F.R.S.
(formerly Director, Imperial Institute of Entomology, London),

H. E. ANDREWES
(Leicester),

W. A. F. BALFOUR-BROWNE
(formerly Professor of Entomology, Department of Entomology, Imperial College of Science
and Technology, London),

K. G. BLAIR, D.Sc.
(formerly Deputy Keeper of the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History)),
and

M. CAMERON.
(British Museum (Natural History), Zoological Museum, Tring).

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)158.)

In the case of the following generic names the strict application of the rules embodied in the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature would cause a serious, and quite unnecessary, disturbance in existing practice and would, in our view, cause greater confusion than uniformity. For this reason we are in favour of a partial suspension of the rules. The object we have in view can be effected by a very slight departure from the strict application of the Code.

The portion of Mr. Andrewes' paper relating to these names was written by him in consultation with us, and we are in full agreement both with his conclusions and with his recommendations, which we summarise as follows:—

THE GENERIC NAMES *HARPALUS* LATREILLE, [1802-1803],¹³ AND *OPHONUS* STEPHENS, 1827.

Latreille, 1810, cited *Carabus ruficornis* Fabricius, 1775 (= *C. rufipes* Degeer, 1774), as the type of *Harpalus* Latreille, but Motschulsky, in subdividing the genus (1845), put this species into his new section *Pseudophonus*, by many authors now considered a distinct genus. In this action he has been followed by all later writers. To obviate the confusion that would inevitably arise were Latreille's citation to be maintained, Andrewes, 1935, proposed the adoption of *Carabus affinis* Schrank, 1781 (= *C. aeneus* Fabricius, 1775), as the type, a proposal with which we agree.

We are therefore of the opinion that in the exercise of the plenary power conferred upon them by the International Zoological Congress the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should as soon as possible take the steps laid down by the Congress for the promulgation of an *Opinion* to the following effect:—

The name *Harpalus* Latreille, [1802-1803]¹³ (type *Carabus aeneus* Fabricius, 1775), is added to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*. The designation by Latreille, 1810, of *Carabus ruficornis* Fabricius (= *rufipes* Degeer) as the type of *Harpalus* Latreille is therefore to be set aside, and that by Andrewes, 1935, of *Carabus aeneus* Fabricius is to be accepted.

¹³ See footnote 11 above.

It is also desirable that the genotype of the genus (or subgenus) *Ophonus* Stephens, 1827, should be definitely settled.

Curtis, 1827, cited *Carabus germanus* Linnaeus, 1758, as type, the fourteenth and last of the species included by Stephens, for which Erichson, 1837, proposed a new genus *Diachromus*, in which it has remained ever since. Westwood, 1838, cited *Carabus obscurus* Fabricius, 1792, the second species on Stephens' list, in which action he has been followed by all later writers. It is very desirable, in order to avoid confusion, that Curtis' type citation be set aside, and that of Westwood accepted.

We are therefore of the opinion that in the exercise of the plenary power conferred on them by the International Zoological Congress the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should as soon as possible take the steps laid down by the Congress for the promulgation of an *Opinion* to the following effect :—

The name *Ophonus* Stephens, 1827 (type *Carabus obscurus* Fabricius, 1792), is added to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*. The designation by Curtis, 1827, of *Carabus germanus* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type of *Ophonus* Stephens is therefore to be set aside and the designation by Westwood, 1838, of *Carabus obscurus* Fabricius is to be accepted.¹⁴

ON THE TYPES OF THE GENERA *LEBIA* LATREILLE, [1802–1803], AND *DROMIUS* SAMOUELLE, 1819 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER COLEOPTERA)

By H. E. ANDREWES

(Leicester.)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)158.)

Lebia Latreille.

Latreille, [1802–1803],¹⁵ (in Sonnini's Buffon), *Hist. nat. gén. partic. Crust. Ins.* 3 : 85.

Latreille, 1810, *Consid. gén. Anim. Crust. Arach. Ins.* : 426.

Andrewes, 1935, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (10) 16 : 24.

Note 1.—Latreille (1810) cited the type as *Carabus quadrimaculatus* Fab., 1792 (= Linn., 1758). In my memoir, quoted above, will be found cogent reasons for the rejection of this citation, which, if it were allowed to stand, would greatly disorganise present nomenclature in the very large genus *Lebia* and in the considerable genus *Dromius* Samouelle, which would have to be known as *Lebia* Latreille. An *Opinion* of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is required to confirm my action (1935) in selecting *Buprestis marginatus* Fourcroy, 1785, as the type of *Lebia* Latreille.

Note 2.—It should perhaps be mentioned here that Curtis, Westwood, and Hope all made *Carabus crux-minor* Linn. the genotype, an invalid citation, as the species was not amongst those enumerated by Latreille.

¹⁴ See footnote 8 above.

¹⁵ See footnote 11 above.

Dromius Samouelle (Bonelli *in litt.*).

Samouelle, 1819, *Ent. Useful Comp.* : 155.

Andrewes, 1935, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (10) 16 : 24.

Note 1.—Any consideration which the International Commission may be asked to give to the fixation of a genotype in the case of *Lebia* Latreille will affect also the position of this genus, for its type (and sole original species) is *Carabus quadrimaculatus* Linn., 1758, which (as explained above) is, under a strict application of the Code, the type of the earlier genus *Lebia* Latreille, [1802–1803].

Note 2.—The name *Dromius* had been previously proposed, presumably by Borkhausen, for a genus of birds (1797, *Allg. Lit. Ztg* 4 (316) : 27), but it is a *nomen nudum*. The name *Dromiassa* Hofmann, 1834 (*Verz. Ins. Latreille* : 1) for *Dromius* Samouelle is therefore superfluous.¹⁶

**PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE RÈGLES FOR *LEBIA* LATREILLE
[1802–1803] (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER COLEOPTERA)**

By SIR GUY A. K. MARSHALL, K.C.M.G., D.Sc., F.R.S.
(formerly Director, Imperial Institute of Entomology, London),

H. E. ANDREWES
(Leicester),

W. A. F. BALFOUR-BROWNE
(formerly Professor of Entomology, Department of Entomology, Imperial College of Science
and Technology, London),

K. G. BLAIR, D.Sc.
(formerly Deputy Keeper of the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History))
and

M. CAMERON
(British Museum (Natural History), Zoological Museum, Tring.)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)158.)

In the case of the following generic name the strict application of the rules embodied in the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature would cause a serious, and quite unnecessary, disturbance in existing practice and would, in our view, cause greater confusion than uniformity. For this name we are in favour of a partial suspension of the rules. The object we have in view can be effected by a very slight departure from the strict application of the Code.

The portion of Mr. Andrewes' paper relating to this name and to the name *Dromius* Samouelle, 1819, which is bound up in the same problem, was written by him in consultation with us, and we are in full agreement both with his conclusions and with his recommendations, which we summarise as follows :—

¹⁶ See footnote 7 above.

THE GENERIC NAMES *LEBIA* LATREILLE, [1802-1803] AND *DROMIUS*
SAMOUELLE, 1819.

Latreille, 1810, cited *Carabus quadrimaculatus* Fabricius (= Linnaeus, 1758), as the genotype of *Lebia* Latreille, but this is the type, the sole species cited, of *Dromius* Samouelle, 1819; hence if Latreille's action be allowed to stand, the name *Lebia* Latreille would replace *Dromius* Samouelle, while the *Lebia* of current usage would require another name.

To avoid the confusion that would follow such a drastic change, Andrewes, 1935, has proposed that Latreille's citation be overruled, and that *Buprestis marginatus* Fourcroy, 1785, already included in *Lebia* s.s. of modern authors, should be deemed the genotype.

We are of the opinion that in the exercise of the plenary power conferred upon them by the International Zoological Congress, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should as soon as possible take the steps laid down by the Congress for the promulgation of an *Opinion* to the following effect :—

The name *Lebia* Latreille, [1802-1803] (type *Buprestis marginatus* Fourcroy, 1785), is added to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*. The designation by Latreille, 1810, of *Carabus quadrimaculatus* Fabricius as the type of *Lebia* Latreille is therefore to be set aside, and that by Andrewes, 1935, of *Buprestis marginatus* Fourcroy is to be accepted.¹⁷

ON THE TYPE OF THE GENUS *TACHYS* STEPHENS, 1828 (CLASS
INSECTA, ORDER COLEOPTERA)

By H. E. ANDREWES.

(Leicester).

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)158.)

Tachys Stephens (Dejean, Cat. 1821).

Stephens, 1828, *Ill. Brit. Ent. (Mand.)* 2 : 2 and 4.

Westwood, 1838, *Syn. gen. Brit. Ins.* : 6.

Hope, 1838, *Col. Man.* 2 : 61.

Motschulsky, 1862, *Études ent.* 9 : 27.

Andrewes, 1935, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist. (10)* 16 : 17.

In my paper quoted above, being unaware at the time of Hope's selection, I had myself proposed *scutellaris* Stephens as type of the genus. Westwood cited *Bembidium obtusum* Serv. as type, but this citation, if accepted, would throw *Tachys* into synonymy with *Bembidion*, a very undesirable arrangement. To obviate the difficulty, I suggest that the International Commission should promulgate an *Opinion*, ruling out Westwood's selection, and accepting that of Hope in its place.¹⁸

¹⁷ See footnote 8 above.

¹⁸ See footnote 7 above.

PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE RÈGLES FOR *TACHYS* STEPHENS, 1828
(CLASS INSECTA, ORDER COLEOPTERA)

By SIR GUY A. K. MARSHALL, K.C.M.G., D.Sc., F.R.S.
(formerly Director, Imperial Institute of Entomology, London),

H. E. ANDREWES
(Leicester),

W. A. F. BALFOUR-BROWNE
(formerly Professor of Entomology, Department of Entomology, Imperial College of Science
and Technology, London),

K. G. BLAIR, D.Sc.
(formerly Deputy Keeper of the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History)),
and

M. CAMERON
(British Museum (Natural History), Zoological Museum, Tring).

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)158.)

In the case of the following generic name the strict application of the rules embodied in the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature would cause a serious, and quite unnecessary, disturbance in existing practice and would, in our view, cause greater confusion than uniformity. For this name we are in favour of a partial suspension of the rules. The object we have in view can be effected by a very slight departure from the strict application of the Code.

The portion of Mr. Andrewes' paper relating to this name was written by him in consultation with us, and we are in full agreement both with his conclusions and with his recommendations, which we summarise as follows :—

THE GENERIC NAME *TACHYS* STEPHENS, 1828.

Westwood, May, 1838, cited *Bembidium obtusum* Sturm, 1825 (= Serville, 1821) as the type of *Tachys*; but this citation, though valid under the Code, would, if adopted, throw *Tachys* into synonymy with *Bembidion* Latreille. To obviate the difficulty and the confusion that would ensue, Andrewes, 1935, being unaware at the time of Hope's citation of *T. scutellaris* Stephens, 1828, (end of 1838 or probably Feb. 1839), independently proposed the same species as type of the genus.

We are therefore of the opinion that in the exercise of the plenary power conferred upon them by the International Zoological Congress the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should as soon as possible take the steps laid down by the Congress for the promulgation of an *Opinion* to the following effect :—

The name *Tachys* Stephens, 1828 (type *T. scutellaris* Stephens, 1828), is added to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*. The designation by Westwood, 1838, of *Bembidion obtusum* Sturm as the type of *Tachys* is therefore to be set aside, and that by Hope, [1838–39], of *T. scutellaris* Stephens is to be accepted.¹⁹

¹⁹ See footnote 8 above.

ON THE TYPES OF THE GENERA *TRECHUS* SCHELLENBERG, 1806, AND
ACUPALPUS LATREILLE, 1829 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER COLEO-
 PTERA)

By H. E. ANDREWES.

(Leicester).

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)158.)

Trechus Schellenberg.

Schellenberg, 1806, *Helv. Ent.* 2 : 23.

Latreille, 1810, *Consid. gén. Anim. Crust. Arach. Ins.* : 426.

Jeannel, 1927, *Mon. des Trechinae* (2), Abeille, 33 : 113 and 114.

Latreille cited as type *Trechus meridianus* Clairville (i.e. Schellenberg), 1806 (= Linn., 1761), one of the two species mentioned by the author of the genus; this is now placed in the genus *Acupalpus*, and a strict interpretation of the law of priority would mean the substitution of the name *Trechus* for *Acupalpus*. Recognising how completely such a change would disorganise the present scheme of classification in these two very large genera, Dr. Jeannel designated *Carabus quadristriatus* Schrank, Schellenberg's second species, as the type of *Trechus*. I quite agree with this view. It is therefore very desirable that the International Commission should be asked to pronounce an *Opinion* setting aside Latreille's citation, and specifying *Carabus quadristriatus* Schrank as the genotype.

This and other genera, commonly attributed to Clairville, were in fact described by Schellenberg: Clairville only translated the German work into French (see Hagen, 1862, *Bibl. Ent.* : 131; Sherborn, 1902, *Ind. Anim.* (1) : xlvii).

Acupalpus Latreille.

Latreille, 1829, in Cuvier's *Règne anim.* (ed. 2) 4 : 391.

Schauberger, 1930, *Koleopt. Rdsch.* 15 : 20; id., 1930, *Coleopt. Zbl.* 4 : 218.

Andrewes, 1934, *Ent. mon. Mag.* 70 : 200.

Latreille (1810) made *Trechus meridianus* Clairville (= Schellenberg) the type of the genus *Trechus*; nevertheless *Carabus meridianus* Linn. is one of the species mentioned after the description of the genus *Acupalpus*. In my paper (1934), and under the genus *Trechus*, I fixed *Carabus meridianus* Linn., 1761, as the type of the genus.²⁰

²⁰ See footnote 7 above.

**PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE RÈGLES FOR TRECHUS SCHELLENBERG,
1806 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER COLEOPTERA)**

By SIR GUY A. K. MARSHALL, K.C.M.G., D.Sc., F.R.S.

(formerly Director, Imperial Institute of Entomology, London),

H. E. ANDREWES

(Leicester),

W. A. F. BALFOUR-BROWNE

(formerly Professor of Entomology, Department of Entomology, Imperial College of Science and Technology, London),

K. G. BLAIR, D.Sc.

(formerly Deputy Keeper of the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History)),

and

M. CAMERON

(British Museum (Natural History), Zoological Museum, Tring).

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)158.)

In the case of the following generic name the strict application of the rules embodied in the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature would cause a serious, and quite unnecessary, disturbance in existing practice and would, in our view, cause greater confusion than uniformity. For this name we are in favour of a partial suspension of the rules. The object we have in view can be effected by a very slight departure from the strict application of the Code.

The portion of Mr. Andrewes' paper relating to this name was written by him in consultation with us, and we are in full agreement both with his conclusions and with his recommendations, which we summarise as follows:—

THE GENERIC NAMES *TRECHUS* SCHELLENBERG, 1806, AND *ACUPALPUS* LATREILLE, 1829.

Latreille, 1810, cited *Carabus meridianus* Clairville, 1806 (*i.e.* Schellenberg, 1806), (= Linnaeus, 1761), as type of *Trechus* Schellenberg, yet in 1829 he placed this species in his new genus *Acupalpus*, of which Andrewes, 1934, made it the genotype.

Jeannel, 1927, recognising how completely Latreille's citation of *meridianus* as the type of *Trechus* would disorganise the present scheme of classification in these two large genera, proposed *Carabus quadristriatus* Schrank, 1781, Schellenberg's second species, as the type of *Trechus*. Andrewes' citation of *C. meridianus* as genotype of *Acupalpus* is in accord with Dr. Jeannel's action.

It is very desirable that this action should be confirmed and Latreille's type citation set aside.

We are therefore of the opinion that in the exercise of the plenary power conferred upon them by the International Zoological Congress the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should as soon as possible take the steps laid down by the Congress for the promulgation of an *Opinion* to the following effect:—

The name *Trechus* Schellenberg, 1806 (type *Carabus quadristriatus* Schrank, 1781), is added to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*. The designation by Latreille, 1810, of *Carabus meridianus* Clairville as the type of *Trechus* is therefore to be set aside, and that by Jeannel, 1927, of *Carabus quadristriatus* Schrank is to be accepted.²¹

²¹ See footnote 8 above.

- On the interpretation of Article 19 of the *Règles Internationales* in relation to the name *Chromodoris mcfarlandi* Cockerell, 1902 (Class Gastropoda, Order Opisthobranchia). By D. P. Costello, *Department of Zoology, University of North Carolina* p. 232
- On the status of the name commonly cited as *Piroplasma annulatum* Dschunkowsky and Luhs, 1904 (Class Sporozoa, Order Coccidiida). By G. Witenberg, *Department of Parasitology, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem* p. 233
- On the question of the place and date of first publication of the name *Piroplasma annulatum* Dschunkowsky and Luhs (Class Sporozoa, Order Coccidiida) commonly treated as having been first published in 1904. By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E., *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* p. 234
- Proposed suspension of the *Règles* for *Tremataspis* Schmidt, 1866 (Class Cephalaspidomorphi, Order Osteostraci). By George M. Robertson, *Department of Biology, Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire* p. 237
- Proposed suspension of the *Règles* to identify *Anomia pecten* Linnaeus, 1758, with the species belonging to the Order Protremata (Class Brachiopoda) commonly known as *Strophomena pecten* (Linnaeus, 1758) p. 239
- On the type of the genus *Chinchilla* Bennett, 1829 (Class Mammalia, Order Rodentia). By Wilfred H. Osgood, *Chicago Natural History Museum* p. 240
- On the status of the name *Aturoidea* Vredenburg, 1925 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Nautiloidea). By M. H. Haas, Ph.D., LL.D., *Department of Geology, British Museum (Natural History)* p. 243
- On the types of the genera *Bradycellus* Erichson, 1837, and *Trichocellus* Ganglbauer, 1892 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera). By H. E. Andrewes, *Leicester* p. 245
- Proposed suspension of the *Règles* for *Bradycellus* Erichson, 1837 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera). By Sir Guy A. K. Marshall, K.C.M.G., D.Sc., F.R.S., *formerly Director of the Imperial Institute of Entomology, London*; H. E. Andrewes, *Leicester*; W. A. F. Balfour-Browne, *formerly Professor of Entomology, Department of Entomology, Imperial College of Science and Technology, London*; K. G. Blair, D.Sc., *formerly Deputy Keeper of the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History)*; and M. Cameron, *British Museum (Natural History), Zoological Museum, Tring* p. 246
- On the type of the genus *Carabus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera). By H. E. Andrewes, *Leicester* p. 247
- Proposed suspension of the *Règles* for *Carabus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera). By Sir Guy A. K. Marshall, K.C.M.G., D.Sc., F.R.S., H. E. Andrewes, W. A. F. Balfour-Browne, K. G. Blair, D.Sc., and M. Cameron p. 248
- On the types of the genera *Harpalus* Latreille, [1802-1803] and *Ophonus* Stephens, 1827 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera). By H. E. Andrewes, *Leicester* p. 249
- Proposed suspension of the *Règles* for *Harpalus* Latreille, [1802-1803] and *Ophonus* Stephens, 1827 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera). By Sir Guy A. K. Marshall, K.C.M.G., D.Sc., F.R.S., H. E. Andrewes, W. A. F. Balfour-Browne, K. G. Blair, D.Sc., and M. Cameron p. 250
- On the types of the genera *Lebia* Latreille, [1802-1803], and *Dromius* Samouelle, 1819 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera). By H. E. Andrewes, *Leicester* p. 251
- Proposed suspension of the *Règles* for *Lebia* Latreille, [1802-1803] (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera). By Sir Guy A. K. Marshall, K.C.M.G., D.Sc., F.R.S., *formerly Director of the Imperial Institute of Entomology, London*; H. E. Andrewes, *Leicester*; W. A. F. Balfour-Browne, *formerly Professor of Entomology, Department of Entomology, Imperial College of Science and Technology, London*; K. G. Blair, D.Sc., *formerly Deputy Keeper of the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History)*; and M. Cameron, *British Museum (Natural History), Zoological Museum, Tring* p. 252
- On the type of the genus *Tachys* Stephens, 1828 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera). By H. E. Andrewes, *Leicester* p. 253
- Proposed suspension of the *Règles* for *Tachys* Stephens, 1828 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera). By Sir Guy A. K. Marshall, K.C.M.G., D.Sc., F.R.S., H. E. Andrewes, W. A. F. Balfour-Browne, K. G. Blair, D.Sc., and M. Cameron p. 254
- On the types of the genera *Trechus* Schellenberg, 1806, and *Acupalpus* Latreille, 1829 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera). By H. E. Andrewes, *Leicester* p. 255
- Proposed suspension of the *Règles* for *Trechus* Schellenberg, 1806 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera). By Sir Guy A. K. Marshall, K.C.M.G., D.Sc., F.R.S., H. E. Andrewes, W. A. F. Balfour-Browne, K. G. Blair, D.Sc., and M. Cameron p. 256

OPINIONS AND DECLARATIONS RENDERED BY THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The above work is being published in three volumes concurrently, namely:—

- VOLUME 1. This volume, which will be published in Sections with continuous pagination, will contain *Declarations* 1-9 (which have never previously been published) and *Opinions* 1-133 (the original issue of which is now out of print). Parts 1-25 (containing *Declarations* 1-9 and *Opinions* 1-16) have now been published. Part 17 containing the index and title page for Section A will be published as soon as possible. The publication of Parts of Section B will be started immediately thereafter.
- VOLUME 2. This volume, which contains the record of the decisions taken by the International Commission at Lisbon in 1935, is being published in two Sections (Sections A and B) with continuous pagination. Of these, Section A, containing *Declarations* 10-12 and *Opinions* 134-160, is now complete. Of Section B, which will contain *Opinions* 161-181, Parts 31-51 (containing *Opinions* 161-181) have now been published. Part 52 containing the index and title page will be published as soon as possible.
- VOLUME 3. This volume, which commenced with *Opinion* 182, will contain the first instalment of the *Opinions* adopted by the International Commission since their meeting at Lisbon in 1935. Parts 1-13 (containing *Opinions* 182-194) have now been published. Further Parts will be published shortly.